

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. CV 24-11210-SRM (MARx) Date June 2, 2025

Title AmGUARD Insurance Company v. Main and Second LLC

Present: The Honorable SERENA R. MURILLO, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Melissa H. Kunig

Not Reported

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

None Present

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

None Present

PROCEEDINGS: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE DISMISSAL FOR LACK OF PROSECUTION

“[I]t is the plaintiff’s responsibility to move a case toward a merits disposition.” *Thomas v. Kernan*, 2019 WL 8888200, at *1 (C.D. Cal. July 10, 2019) (citing *Morris v. Morgan Stanley & Co.*, 942 F.2d 648, 652 (9th Cir. 1991)). That includes, where applicable, promptly (a) filing stipulations extending a defendant’s time to respond to the complaint, (b) pursuing default and remedies under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55 when a defendant fails to timely respond to the complaint, or (c) dismissing a case the plaintiff has chosen not to pursue for any reason.

Here, Plaintiff has filed a proof of service, yet the deadline for Defendant to respond to the Complaint has passed and Plaintiff has taken no action. Accordingly, the court, on its own motion, hereby **ORDERS** Plaintiff to show cause in writing, no later than **June 9, 2025**, why this action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. As an alternative to a written response by Plaintiff, the Court will consider as an appropriate response to this OSC the filing of one of the following on or before the above date:

1. Plaintiff’s Request for Entry of Default as to *all Defendants* or Defendants’ Answer(s),
2. A stipulation extending Defendants’ time to respond to the Complaint that complies with Local Rule 8.3, or
3. A notice of Voluntary Dismissal (Fed. R. Civ. P. 41) as to *all Defendants*.

No oral argument of this matter will be heard unless ordered by the Court. The Order will stand submitted upon the filing of a timely and appropriate response. Failure to file a timely and appropriate response to this Order may result in dismissal without further notice or order from the court. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); L. R. 41-6; *Link v. Wabash R.R.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629 (1962) (“The authority of a federal trial court to dismiss a plaintiff’s action with prejudice because of his failure to prosecute cannot seriously be doubted.”); *Hells Canyon Pres. Council v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 403 F.3d

//
//

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. CV 24-11210-SRM (MARx) Date June 2, 2025

Title AmGUARD Insurance Company v. Main and Second LLC

683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005) (“[C]ourts may dismiss under Rule 41(b) sua sponte, at least under certain circumstances.”); *Ash v. Cvetkov*, 739 F.2d 493, 496 (9th Cir. 1984) (“It is within the inherent power of the court to sua sponte dismiss a case for lack of prosecution.”).

Initial of Deputy Clerk mku